

REMARKS

The Official Action of December 15, 2005, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 1-21, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 1-21 remain in the application for consideration. Applicant thanks the Examiner for his indication that claims 1, 3, 5-11, 13 and 15-20 have been allowed.

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 4, 12, 14 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the dependent claims are directed to a "program of instructions", whereas the independent claims are directed to a "system and method" respectively.

In response to the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection, Applicant has amended claims 2, 4, 12, 14 and 21 to be independent claims as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant having overcome the Examiner's rejection, respectfully submits that claims 2, 4, 12, 14 and

Appln. No. 10/078,111
Amdt. dated March 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated Dec. 15, 2004

21 are now also allowable and that this application is in condition for allowance.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By



Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\C\cohn\Abraham3\PTO\Amendment-A.doc